REMARKS

Claims 29 and 31 are amended, no claims are canceled, and claims 33-56 are added; as a result, claims 29-56 are now pending in this application.

Amendments were made to the specification to correct an obvious typographical error. Specifically, the phrase "507" was changed to "506" in three places on page 12 of the specification in order to correct the specification so that the specification matches the drawings and the previous paragraph(s) of the specification. No new matter has been added by the amendments to the specification.

Support for the amendments to claims 29 and 31 can be found, for example, in the specification on page 6, at lines 9-17, and on page 8 at lines 9-16 and lines 24-26. In addition to these portions of the specification, further support for new claims 33-56 can be found throughout the specification, for example, on page 7, line 14 through page 9, line 5. Addition support for new claims 41-53 can be found in the specification on page 15, line 3 through page 16, line 2, and in FIG. 7A. Additional support for new claims 54-56 can be found in the specification on page 16, lines 3-11, and in FIG. 7B. No new matter has been added through the amendments to claims 29 and 31, and no new matter has been added through the addition of claims 33-56.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pantelakis et al. (U.S. 6,275,070). The patent to Pantelakis et al. is a removable reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Applicant does not admit that the Pantelakis et al. patent is prior art to the present invention and respectfully reserves the right to swear behind the Pantelakis et al. patent at a later date. Applicant chooses at this time to merely distinguish the Pantelakis et al. patent.

Amended Claims 29 and 31 Distinguish over the Pantelakis et al. patent

The Pantelakis et al. patent fails to disclose all of the elements recited in claims 29-32, as claims 29-32 are now amended. For example, claims 29 and 31, as amended, recite, "a split-level output circuit coupled to the static voltage-level converter, the split-level output circuit including a first split-level input node and a second split-level input node, the second split-level

node directly coupled to an output of the inverter, and the first split-level node adapted to receive a complementary signal of the signal received at the second split-level node."

The Office Action on page 2 relies on element 166 of FIG. 4 in the Pantelakis et al. patent as providing a split-level output circuit. Applicant disagrees that element 166 in the Pantelakis et al. patent is a split-level output circuit. The Pantelakis et al. patent at column 5, lines 49-50 merely states, "Inverter 166 includes P-channel transistor 168 and N-channel transistor 170." Thus, the Pantelakis et al. patent describes element 166 as merely an inverter, and not a split-level output circuit.

However, Applicant has amended claims 29 and 31 to include a first and a second split-level input node, including "the second split-level input node directly coupled to an output of the inverter, and the first split-level input node adapted to receive a complementary signal of the signal received at the second split-level input node." In contrast, Figure 4 of the Pantelakis et al. patent fails to show a first split-level input node and a second split-level input node coupled as recited in claims 29 and 31. The Pantelakis et al. patent at column 6, lines 10-15 merely states,

> P-channel transistor 168 has a source connected to VDD, a drain for providing a clock signal labeled 'CLKB', and a gate connected to the drain of P-channel transistor 158. N-channel transistor 170 has a drain connected to the drain of P-channel transistor 168, a source, and a gate connected to the gate of P-channel transistor 168.

Thus, the Pantelakis et al. patent discloses both gates of inverter 166 tied to a drain of a P-channel transistor, but fails to disclose a split level output circuit including a first split-level input node and a second split-level input node, the second split-level input node directly coupled to an output of the inverter, and the first split-level input node adapted to receive a complementary signal of the signal received at the second split-level input node.

Claim 30 and new claims 33-36 depend from claim 29. Claim 32 and new claims 37-40 depends from claim 31. Therefore, claims 30 and 33-36 include all of the elements recited in amended claim 29, and claims 32 and 37-40 include all of the elements recited in amended claim 31. Because all of the elements recited in claims 29-32 are not described in the Pantelakis et al. patent, the rejection of claims 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) cannot stand. Further, claims 33-36 and 37-40 are also distinguish the Pantelakis et al. patent. Therefore, Applicant respectfully

requests reconsideration of the rejections of claims 29-32, and allowance of all claims, including new claims 33-36 and 37-40.

New claims 41-56 also Distinguish from the Pantelakis et al. patent

New claims 41-56 also recite elements not disclosed by the Pantelakis et al. patent, and therefore are patentable over the Pantelakis et al. patent. These new claims are found as part of elected Group I of the species restriction requirement.

By way of example and not by way of limitation, new independent claims 41, 48, and 54 all include "a split-level output circuit coupled to the static voltage-level converter, the split-level output circuit including a first split-level input node and a second split-level input node, the second split-level input node directly coupled to an output of the inverter, and the first split-level input node adapted to receive a complementary signal of the signal received at the second split-level input node," which is missing from the Pantelakis et al. patent. Claims 42-47, 49-53, and 55-56 depend from claims 41, 48, and 54 respectively, and therefore include all of the elements recited in the claim from which they depend.

For at least these reasons, and additional elements recited in new claims 41-56, Applicant respectfully requests consideration of claims 41-56, and allowance of all claims.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6904 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

STEVEN K. HSU ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 373-6904

Date Sep. 6, 2005

By Daniel J. Kluth
Daniel J. Kluth
Reg. No. 32,146

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 6th day of September, 2005.

Amy Moriarty
Name

Signature